

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach the claimed invention. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-9 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner further rejected claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,470,388 to Niemi, et al. (Niemi). The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi. The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 11, 14-16, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of United States Patent 6,144,967 to Nock (Nock). The Examiner rejected claims 17, 18, 20, 22, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of Nock and in further view of United States Patent 5,740,354 to Ben-Natan, et al. (Ben-Natan). The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of Nock and in further view of United States Patent 5,819,094 to Sato, et al. (Sato).

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 19, 21, and 23-25. Applicants have not added or canceled any claim. Accordingly, claims 1-25 will be pending in the application after entry of this Amendment.

**I. Statement of Substance of the Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview on 11/16/2004. In the interview, no exhibit was shown and no demonstration was conducted. Applicants' representative discussed the Niemi reference with the Examiner. As a follow up to interview with the Examiner, Applicants have amended the claims to place the claims in better condition for allowance.

-- 7 --

Apple Docket: P2554  
Attorney Docket: APLE.P0005  
PTO Serial: 09/618,367

**II. Objection to the Specification in Relation to Claims 1, 19, 21 and 23, and Rejection of Claims 1-9 and 19-25 Under §112, First Paragraph**

The Examiner objected to the specification in relation to claims 1, 19 and 21 as failing to adequately teach the claimed invention. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-9 and 19-22 under §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that while claims 1-9 and 19-22 recite an "event object occupying a memory space and executing independent of said applications," there was no detailed description of such an event object that "executes." In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 19, and 21 to recite an "event object occupying a memory space that is independent of said applications." Applicants respectfully submit that this limitation is supported in numerous instances in the specification. For instance, the specification on page 8, lines 2-3, states that "the event object subsists in a memory space called an 'event center' wholly independent of any other applications." See also, page 13, lines 16-17, and page 14, lines 4-17, of the specification in the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 19, and 21 comply with the enablement requirement. Since claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1, claim 20 is dependent on claim 19, and claim 22 is dependent on claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that the "event object" of these claims is also sufficiently enabled by virtue of their dependence. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification and the §112 rejection of claims 1-9 and 19-22.

-- 8 --

Apple Docket: P2554  
Attorney Docket: APLE.P0005  
PTO Serial: 09/618,367

The Examiner also objected to the specification in relation to claim 23 and rejected claims 23-25 under §112, first paragraph. Specifically the Examiner stated that the detailed description does not disclose an event-logging "application." However, the Examiner identified numerous instances of an event-logging mechanism and an even logging center in the specification of the present application. Thus, Applicants have amended claim 23 to recite an event-logging mechanism to comport with the specification and the other claims in the present application. *See e.g.*, page 6, line 19 through page 7, line 8, page 13, line 10-14, of the specification, and claims 10 and 25 in the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 23 complies with the enablement requirement. Since claims 24-25 are dependent on claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are also sufficiently enabled by virtue of their dependence. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification and the §112 rejection of claims 23-25.

### III. Rejection of Claims 24-25 Under §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 24-25 under §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Specifically the Examiner objected to the phrases "the event object" and "said third event-logging mechanism" for having improper antecedent basis. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 24 and 25 to provide antecedent basis for these terms. For instance, as amended claim 24 recites an associated event object, said associated event object storing a temporal attribute of the event in said associated event object. Amended claim 25 recites said event-logging mechanism in reference to the event-logging mechanism of claim 23. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 24 and 25.

-- 9 --

Apple Docket: P2554  
Attorney Docket: APLE.P0005  
PTO Serial: 09/618,367

**IV. Rejection of Claims 1-4 Under §103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of Nock. The Examiner rejected claim 4 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of Nock and in further view of Sato. Claims 2-4 are dependent directly or indirectly on independent claim 1. Claim 1 recites a method that creates, for every event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application, an event object. The event object so created occupies a memory space that is independent of the application. The method also logs within the event object the start time, end time and information regarding the event.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references neither separately nor in combination disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Niemi teaches at column 12, lines 11-15, that the event logging mechanism logs start time (time stamp 516) and other event information (fields 518, 520, 522, 524) into an event object (record or data entry 514) for every event to be logged. The Examiner states the Niemi does not teach logging end time but cites Nock to disclose this limitation. However, Niemi describes such logging only in relation to a debugger where, to instantiate a debug object, the programming code for the application includes a constructor that is configured to create objects from the base Debug class 400. See Niemi column 9, lines 60-65. Thus, Niemi's application contains code that performs part of Niemi's described logging. In contrast, claim 1 recites creating, for every event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application, an event object that occupies a memory space that is independent of the application.

Moreover, the record or data entry 514 cited in Niemi logs events that have already been logged by a debug object in the application 208a/208b. See Niemi, columns 11 and 12. Therefore, Niemi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest creating an event object for every

event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application. Thus, Niemi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest several limitations recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, separately or in hindsight piecemeal combination, do not invalidate or otherwise render unpatentable claim 1. As  
5 claims 2-4 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-4.

**V. Rejection of Claims 10 and 13 Under §102(e), and Claims 11-12 and 14-18 Under  
10 §103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 13 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Niemi. The Examiner rejected claim 12 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi. The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 14-16 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of Nock. The Examiner rejected claims 17-18 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of  
15 Nock and in further view of Ben-Natan. Claims 11-18 are dependent directly on independent claim 10. Claim 10 recites a system that comprises a foundational layer upon which applications are built and executed. The system further comprises an event logging mechanism operating independently of the applications. This event logging mechanism generates an event log for any of the applications. Furthermore, the event logging mechanism operates without referencing any  
20 event log of the applications.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references neither separately nor in combination disclose, teach, or even suggest such a system. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Niemi teaches a logging service layer 316/318 and centralized logger 236 as

generating an event log (record 514) for the application, without referencing any event log of the application 208a/208b. However, the logging service layer and the centralized logger reference a debug object of the application 208a/208b. This debug object is an event log. See Niemi, columns 11 and 12. Therefore, Niemi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest a system having  
5 an event logging mechanism that generates an event log for any of the applications, without referencing any event log of the applications.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, separately and in hindsight piecemeal combination, do not render unpatentable claim 10. As claims 11-18 are dependent on claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-18 are patentable over the  
10 cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 10. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claims 10 and 13 and the §103(a) rejection of claims 11-12 and 14-18.

#### VI. Rejection of Claims 19-20 Under §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view  
15 of Nock. The Examiner rejected claim 20 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of Nock and in further view of Ben-Natan. Claim 20 is dependent directly on independent claim 19. Claim 19 recites an article comprising a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon. These instructions create, for every event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application, an event object. The event object so created occupies a memory  
20 space that is independent of the application. The instructions also log within the event object the start time, end time and information regarding the event.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references neither separately nor in combination disclose, teach, or even suggest such a computer program. In the Office Action, the

-- 12 --

Apple Docket: P2554  
Attorney Docket: APLE.P0005  
PTO Serial: 09/618,367

Examiner states that Niemi teaches a logging service layer 316/318 and centralized logger 236 as creating an event object (record 514) for every event to be logged, that has not yet been logged within an application 208a/208b. However, the cited record 514 logs events that have already been logged by a debug object in the application 208a/208b. See Niemi, columns 11 and 12.

5 Therefore, Niemi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest creating an event object for every event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not invalidate or otherwise render unpatentable claim 19. As claim 20 is dependent on claim 19, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons  
10 that were discussed above for claim 19. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 19-20.

#### VII. Rejection of Claims 21-22 Under §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of Nock. The Examiner rejected claim 22 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in  
15 view of Nock and in further view of Ben-Natan. Claim 22 is dependent directly on independent claim 21. Claim 21 recites an apparatus that comprises means for creating, for every event object to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application, an event object. The event object so created occupies a memory space that is independent of the application. The apparatus further comprises means for logging within the event object the start time, end time and information  
20 regarding the event.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references neither separately nor in combination disclose, teach, or even suggest such an apparatus. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Niemi teaches a logging service layer 316/318 and centralized logger 236 as

creating an event object (record 514) for every event to be logged, that has not yet been logged within an application 208a/208b. However, the record 514 cited in Niemi logs events that have already been logged by a debug object in the application 208a/208b. See Niemi, columns 11 and 12. Therefore, Niemi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest creating an event object for every event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 21 unpatentable. As claim 22 is dependent on claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 21. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 21 and 22.

#### **VIII. Rejection of Claims 23-25 Under §103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 23 and 24 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi. The Examiner rejected claim 25 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of Nock and in further view of Ben-Natan. Claims 24-25 are dependent on independent claim 23. Claim 23 recites a system that comprises a foundational layer upon which applications are built and executed. The system further comprises a first and second application for executing on the foundational layer. The system further comprises an event-logging mechanism for execution on the foundational layer. This event-logging mechanism functions interoperably with, but separately from, the first and second applications. The event-logging mechanism generates an event log for either one of, or for both of, the first and second applications. At least one of the first and second applications does not generate an event log.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references neither separately nor in combination disclose, teach, or even suggest such a system. In the Office Action, the Examiner



states that Niemi teaches a logging service layer 316/318 and centralized logger 236 as generating an event log (record 514) for the application 208a/208b, where the application does not generate an event log. However, Niemi's applications 208a/208b generate debug objects. These debug objects are event logs. See Niemi, columns 11 and 12. Therefore, Niemi does not  
5 disclose, teach, or even suggest a system having an event logging mechanism that generates an event log for either of the first and second applications, where at least one of the first and second applications does not generate an event log.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not invalidate claim 23 or otherwise render this claim unpatentable. As claims 24-25 are dependent on claim  
10 23, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-25 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 23. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103)(a) rejection of claims 23-25.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims, namely claims 1-25, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

5

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 12/21/2004



10

Andy T. Pho  
Reg. No. 48,862

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP  
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1050  
Century City, CA 90067  
Phone: (310) 785-0140 x303  
Fax: (310) 785-9558

-- 16 --

Apple Docket: P2554  
Attorney Docket: APLE.P0005  
PTO Serial: 09/618,367